

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JARED ANDREW MARTIN,

Plaintiff,

v.

OFFICER NORTHCUTT, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 1:22-cv-00748-ADA-EPG (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS

(ECF Nos. 1, 12)

Plaintiff Jared Martin is a prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On September 14, 2022, the assigned Magistrate Judge entered screening findings and recommendations recommending “[t]his case proceed on Plaintiff’s Eighth Amendment excessive force claim against defendant Northcutt, Plaintiff’s Eighth Amendment failure to protect claim against defendant Williams, and Plaintiff’s First Amendment retaliation claim against defendant Williams.” (ECF No. 12 at 14.) The assigned Magistrate Judge recommended “[a]ll other claims and defendants be dismissed.” (*Id.*) The findings and recommendations were served on the parties and contained notice that any objections thereto must be filed within fourteen (14) days. (*Id.*) Plaintiff has not filed objections and the time to do so has expired.

///

1 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, the  
2 Court has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the  
3 Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and proper analysis.

4 Accordingly, IT IS SO ORDERED:

- 5 1. The findings and recommendations issued on September 14, 2022 (ECF No. 12),  
6 are adopted in full;
- 7 2. This case proceeds on Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment excessive force claim against  
8 Defendant Northcutt, Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment failure to protect claim  
9 against Defendant Williams, and Plaintiff's First Amendment retaliation claim  
10 against Defendant Williams;
- 11 3. All other claims and Defendants are dismissed; and
- 12 4. The Clerk of Court is directed to reflect the dismissal of Defendants Pfeiffer and  
13 Allison on the Court's docket.

14  
15  
16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 Dated: June 1, 2023

18   
19 \_\_\_\_\_  
20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28